

APR 05 2006

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0851-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) P14850500	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____ Signature _____ Typed or printed name _____		Application Number 09/472,666	Filed 12/27/1999
		First Named Inventor THOMAS, KEITH C.	
		Art Unit 3622	Examiner ALVAREZ, R.
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the <input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. 35,987 Registration number _____ <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____		Signature JEFFREY A. PROEHL Typed or printed name (605) 232-1967 Telephone number APRIL 5, 2006 Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
<input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.8. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 05 2006

Attorney's Docket No. 25-0095/30029

Client's Docket No. P1485US00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appln. No. 09/472,666)

First Named Applicant: KEITH C. THOMAS)

Filed: 12/27/1999)

For: METHOD AND MEDIA FOR VIRTUAL
PRODUCT PLACEMENT)

TC/A.U.: 3622)

Examiner: Raquel ALVAREZ)

Attorney: Jeffrey A. Proehl)

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Arlington, VA 22313-1450

MEMO IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Claims 19, 20, 22 through 39 and 55 through 66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebisawa (USPN 5,946,664, hereinafter "Ebisawa") in view of Margulis (USPN 6,456,340, hereinafter "Margulis").

Claim 19 requires, in part, "wherein the communication assembly allows the virtual product source to *update the position of the virtual product location in the removable moving media through repositioning of the removable content relative to the source content*" (emphasis added). Similarly, but not identically, claim 33 requires "wherein the virtual product is updated on the moving media in the virtual product location, and *the position of the virtual product location relative to the moving media is updated*" (emphasis added). Further, claims 55, 56 and 66 each require "wherein the communication assembly allows the virtual product source to *update the position of the virtual product location in the removable moving media through repositioning of the removable content relative to the source content*" (emphasis added).

Before addressing the merits of the rejections in detail, it is noted that in the Advisory Action mailed March 22, 2006 for this application, it is alleged that (emphasis added):

The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because in Ebisawa on col. 3, lines 29-34, it recites "As seen from both FIGS. 1A and 1B, advertisements "A" and "B" are displayed in the same scene of the auto racing program (of course, at different times) and advertisements "C"

and "D" also are displayed in the same scene of the auto racing program". Therefore as can be seen from the above passage, the advertisements are displayed on the same location at different times therefore the location of the advertisements change in order to clear the space for the other advertisements to take its place.

It is submitted that the highlighted statement in the paragraph above is at the heart of the disagreement in this case, as in the same sentence the Examiner has taken the position that displaying advertisements in the *same* location is *changing* the location of the advertisement. There does not appear to be any way to reconcile this statement that resolves the inherent conflict within this statement. As will become evident from the following, the rejections are based upon the belief that merely changing *what* is displayed at a (same) location is actually changing *the* location. In any event, claim 19 (as well as the other claims) requires the *repositioning*, or updating the position through repositioning, of the removable content with respect to the source content.

It was alleged in the final rejection of the claims in the Office Action that (emphasis added):

With respect to the newly amended feature of updating the position of the virtual product location in the removable moving media through repositioning of the removable content relative to the source content (i.e. In Figures 1A-1B, and Figures 2A-2B, In order for advertisements A and C to be replaced with advertisements B and D, the location of advertisements A and C has to be changed in order for advertisements B and D to take it's place. Therefore advertisements B and D's location is also updated or improved from a non-display location to a display location).

However, the allegation that "the location of A and C *has to be changed* in order for advertisements B and D to take it's place" appears to not be based upon what Ebisawa actually teaches, but instead appears to be based upon what the Patent Office believes *should* happen. If one looks to the actual disclosure of the Ebisawa patent, particularly Figures 1A and 1B, one of ordinary skill in the art sees that the sequential positions of the advertisement data elements "A" and "B" in the Ebisawa system does not change. More specifically, the positions of the advertisement data elements on the screen in Figures 1A and 1B is *identical*, and thus *is not changed* or "reposition[ed]... *relative to the source content*" as required by the claims.

One can speculate that the position of the advertisement data elements "A" and "B" is changed in the Ebisawa system, but that is merely speculation of what "has to be", and not an actual teaching or disclosure of the Ebisawa patent. Perhaps the Patent Office is relying upon an "inherent" teaching of the Ebisawa patent (which was not identified in the Office Action), but when the Ebisawa patent discloses the *position* of the advertisement data elements "A" and "B" as

identical and unchanging (such as in Figures 1A and 1B), this appears to be inconsistent with any "inherent" teaching of changing positions.

In the "Response to Arguments" portion of the final Office Action, it is contended that:

Applicant argues that Ebisawa doesn't teach that the position of the removable content relative to the source content may be updated. The Examiner respectfully disagree with Applicant because in Ebisawa the location of advertisement B and D are updated. In Figures 1A-1B, and Figures 2A-2B, In order for advertisements A and C to be replaced with advertisements B and D, the location of advertisements A and C has to be changed in order for advertisements B and D to take it's place. Therefore advertisements B and D's location is also updated or Improved from a non-display location to a display location.

Again, this portion of the remarks in the Office Action relies upon the belief that "the location of advertisements A and C *has to be changed*". The language of the claims addresses the *positioning* of the "removable content *relative to* the source content", and not merely the "location" of advertisements, and thus it is the position of the removable content relative to the source content that is updated, and not merely the content of the advertisement that is updated.

The distinction between what Ebisawa shows and the requirements of the claims becomes more clear when one looks to the disclosure of the Ebisawa, such as at col. 5, lines 35 through 50, where it states:

In either case, commercial advertisements are kept "current", and since the amount of advertisement data is relatively small compared to the size of the game program itself, the amount of "download" time is small in the first discussed embodiment. Of course, the download time of advertisement selection code S in the second discussed embodiment is insubstantial.

In accordance with the present invention, updated or "new" advertisement data is downloaded or a new advertisement selection code is downloaded each time a game program is executed. However, such data need not be downloaded every time the game program is executed, and instead, may be downloaded only on a new day or a new week (or month) on which the game program is executed.

As can be appreciated from this portion of the Ebisawa patent, it lacks any discussion of the updating of the *position* of the "advertisement data" in the game (in contrast to the updating of the *content* of the advertisement), and therefore it is submitted that Ebisawa would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to "repositioning of the removable content relative to the source content" as required in claim 19, or the similar requirements in the other independent claims.

In summary, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, considering the disclosure of

the Ebisawa patent, would be led to "advertisement data A, B, C, and D" that is uniformly located in the same *location*, even as the advertisement data displayed is changed from A to B to C to D, and so forth. Considering Figures 1A and 1B of the Ebisawa patent, it is clear that the position of the advertisement data *remains the same* and that there is no updating of the position of the advertisement data. Similarly and consistently, Figures 2A and 2B show the substitution of "D" for "C" in the video game, but the position is clearly not changed or updated.

It is therefore submitted that not only does the Ebisawa not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to "the communication assembly allow[ing] the virtual product source to update the position of the virtual product location in the removable moving media through repositioning of the removable content relative to the source content", as the Ebisawa could only lead one of ordinary skill in the art toward a consistent, unchanging location for its advertising data that is not updated when the advertisement data is changed. It is therefore also submitted that the allegedly obvious combination of Ebisawa and Margulis would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the combination of requirements of claims 33, 55, 56, and 66, and in particular the requirements set forth above.


Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 22 through 25, 33 through 39, and 55 through 66 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

GATEWAY, INC.

By 
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 24,333
Gateway, Inc.
610 Gateway Dr., Y-04
N. Sioux City, SD 57049
Telephone (605) 232-1967
Fax (605) 232-2612

Date:

